Response to 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 12-13 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Further, the Examiner stated that there was an unclear antecedent in claim 1, line 8 and the item identified as 230 in the specification.

Applicant has amended claims 1 and 12 to correct the antecedent issue an amended the paragraph on page 9 of the application to clarify the reference oscillator and crystal oscillator. Applicant now believes that claims 1 and 12-14 are in condition for allowance.

Response to 35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-7, 15 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Woo et al. US Patent No. 6,125,135 in view of applicant's admitted prior art on page 8, lines 7-10.

On page 8, lines 7-11, the Applicant explains what is shown and taught in the prior art as:

> "U.S. Patent No. 4,701,934, issued to Jasper, which is incorporated by reference herein, presents a system where the LNA output filter 204 is used as the receiver noise bandwidth setting filter, but in the implementation described in the Jasper patent, this filter 204 is also used to attenuate out of band intermodulation products and high level out of band spurious signals that could cause receiver 106 performance degradation.
>
> In the present invention the noise bandwidth of the receiver 106 is set in the IF filter 206 following the image reject mixer 208..."

Thus, the '934 patent teaches using the LNA output filter 204 as the receiver noise bandwidth setting filter. This is opposed to the IF filter 206 following the image reject mixer 208 setting the noise bandwidth of the receiver. Therefore, the '934 patent teaches using a LNA output filter

and not an IF filter. Furthermore, Applicant is not claiming limiting the noise bandwidth with "a filter." Applicant's claim 1 requires an IF active filter.

Claim 1 as amended also recites the limitation of a frequency synthesizer section including an integrated Voltage Controlled Oscillator and reference oscillator with a frequency of 24.5535 MHz plus or minus 40 parts per million (ppm). The Woo Patent, Ciccarelli patent, and the reference cited on page 8 of the specification fail to teach or describe a reference oscillator of 24.5535 MHz being used in a GPS RF Front End.

The Examiner also rejected claims 2 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Woo et al. US Patent No. 6,125,135 in view of applicant's admitted prior art on page 8, lines 7-10 and further in view of Ciccarelli et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,359,940. Claims 2 and 16 are dependent claims that depend from now allowable independent claims, making claims 2 and 16 allowable.

Therefore, independent claim 1 and all claims that depend from independent claim 1 are in condition for allowance.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JUN 18 2007

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing arguments and amendment, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-7 and 12-18 as presented are in a condition for allowance, for which action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
Attorney for Assignee
Gregory B. Gulliver, Reg. 44,138

Phone: (847) 288-3551
Fax: (312) 264-2387

THE ECLIPSE GROUP LLP
100 Tri-State International
Suite 128
Lincolnshire, IL 60069

Customer No. 34408